UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,187	07/31/2003	Craig B. Green	BO1 - 0210US	3174
60483 7590 03/14/2008 LEE & HAYES, PLLC 421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER	
			GIBSON, RANDY W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2841	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/14/2008	PAPER

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/633,187	GREEN, CRAIG B.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Randy W. Gibson	2841			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
		3 G. <b>3</b> . <b>2</b> . 6.			
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> </ul>					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
<ul> <li>9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/9/03.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa 6)  Other:	te			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zoeke et al (US # 4,334,955). Zoeke disclose the claimed invention including a tray (10), a resilient leaf spring (18), and an empty container switch (22).
- 2. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pearson (US # 5,307,250). Pearson discloses the claimed invention including a tray (10), a resilient coil spring (22), and an empty container switch (Col. 4, lines 30-40).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susumu (US # 4,108,363) in view of Zoeke et al (US # 4,334,955) and Mairot et al (US # 4,582,151). Susumu disclose the claimed invention except the switch that trips when the shelf is near empty, and the slideable shelf Susumu has a complex weighing mechanism instead of a weight activated switch; however, Zoeke shows that such a switch is known, and it would be less complex and less expensive to implement than a load cell equipped system. It would have been obvious to the ordinary practioner to replace a complex load cell based system of Susumu with just a spring supported shelf and limit switch, such as the design of Zoeke, to produce a cheaper and simpler to install design.

As for the weighing device being on a slidable shelf, Mairot shows that this was known, and it would have been obvious to the ordinary practioner in order to make the items more accessible to the shopper.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy W. Gibson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2103. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri., 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F. Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-2245. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/633,187 Page 4

Art Unit: 2841

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Randy W. Gibson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2841

Randy W. Gibson Primary Examiner Art Unit 2841